every Travancorean is interested in the Policeman's safety. Only such provisions as are absolutely needed ought to be retained in the present Bill. The Sections which I have mentioned have a very mischievous tendency and it is wrong to include them in the Bill. With these observations, I would affirm the principle of the Bill. But at the same time, I would say that considerable change is required to be made therein."

Mr. Parameswaran Pillai:—"That a law for the regulation of the Police officers in Travancore is necessary can admit of no doubt, and I have great pleasure in supporting generally the principle of this measure. Of course there are various provisions in the Bill on which differences of opinion are possible and are inevitable. It is difficult to separate the principle of a measure from the details. Sometimes in a measure such as this and the one the principle of which was affirmed a little while ago, while the principle is affirmed, there may be various provisions in the Bill with which one cannot agree. I would associate myself with my friend Mr. Velu Pillai in objecting to the introduction of provisions such as those in regard to sanction of Government for the prosecution of Police officers, investing the Police Commissioner with First Class Magistrate's powers and the power to interfere with public meetings, speeches and so forth. Of course these are matters which may be dealt with at a further stage of the Bill, in the Select Committee as well as in the second reading even. I would not take the time of the Council in discussing these matters at this stage."

Mr. Subba Aiyar:—"With regard to the objections raised by Mr. Velu Pillai regarding the additional Police and the Special Police, I have to state that I have not introduced any change in the existing law. These Clauses have been bodily taken from the existing Regulation. With regard to Clause 71, I may say that the learned Chief Justice himself distinctly says that if the Legislature means to have the provision of the Regulation extended or if it is intended that the Section should have a wider scope, it is the duty of the Legislature to make the meaning clear. It is with this object that the present Clause has been introduced. The other observations of my friend Mr. Parameswaran Pillai may be considered by the Select Committee, and they do not affect the principle of the Bill. With these words, I beg to move that the principle of the Bill be affirmed."

The motion was accordingly carried.

Mr. Subba Aiyar then moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Mahadeva Aiyar, Raman Pillai, Parameswaran Pillai, Velu Pillai and the Mover, to report within three months.

Seconded by Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar.

Carried.

THE CIVIL COURTS REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Subba Aiyar moved that the Civil Courts Regulation Amendment Bill be finally read and passed.

Seconded by Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar.

Carried.

THE COPYRIGHT REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

Section 1, sub-section (3).

Mr. Subba Aiyar moved that the words "the 1st Chingom 1093" be added at the end of sub-section (3) of Section 1.

Seconded by Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar.

Carried.

Section 19, sub-section (7), Clause (b).

Mr. Subba Aiyar moved that the words "Chingom 1093" be inserted after the words "first day of" in line 3 of Clause (*b*) of sub-section (7) of Section 19, and that the words "the 1st Chingom 1093" be added at the end of the same Clause.

Seconded by Mr. Rengaswamy Aiyangar.

Carried.

Section 29.

Mr. Subba Aiyar moved that the words "one year" be substituted for "six (6) Calendar months" occurring in line 2 of Section 29.

Seconded by Mr. Rengaswamy Aiyangar.

Carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly